

EXCEEDS ITS SCOPE

MR. CLEVELAND'S DOCTRINE FAR
BROADER THAN MONROE'S.That is Mr. Sewall's Opinion, and He
Wants Congress to Repudiate Part
of the President's Claim.

HALE ON THE PACIFIC CABLE

HE THINKS UNCLE SAM SHOULD PAY
A SUBSIDY OF \$250,000.Little Interest in the Senate Bond-
Bill Debate—Features of the Pen-
sion Discussion in the House.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16.—Consideration of the silver bond bill proceeded in the Senate to-day with Mr. Peffer continuing his speech begun yesterday. Interest in the discussion has begun to lag, as was evident by the scant attendance on the floor and in the galleries. As yet no suggestion has been made as to bringing the measure to a vote. Foreign questions received considerable attention during the day. Mr. Hale spoke for an hour in favor of a Pacific cable connecting the United States and Hawaii, and the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States was certain to be accomplished at an early day. The Cuban question was briefly discussed in connection with Mr. Call's resolution calling on the State Department for information on the status of the expedition. The Monroe doctrine also received attention in a resolution by Mr. Sewall, of New Jersey, declaring the limitations of the doctrine and stating that President Cleveland's attitude was an extension of the doctrine beyond its original scope. A resolution was adopted requesting the State Department for further information on Turkish-Armenian affairs.

When the Senate convened Mr. Allen called attention to the indefinite postponement of his bill prohibiting American citizens from receiving foreign titles, decorations, etc. It occurred through an oversight of the Senate that the bill was not brought up for consideration, as the people did not believe in the undemocratic practice and wanted it stopped. The request was agreed to.

Mr. Hansbrough, from the committee on agriculture, reported favorably the resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the law relative to the distribution of seeds and of government publications.

Mr. Call offered a resolution directing the Secretary of State to send to Congress all the letters and telegrams received from Cuba concerning the present war.

Mr. Cullom presented a resolution, which was agreed to, requesting the State Department for information as to whether materialized United States citizens of Armenian birth were allowed to visit Turkey, whether their families living in Turkey were allowed to depart for the United States, and whether American living in Turkey had the same rights as were accorded to citizens of Great Britain, Germany, France, and Italy.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. Sewall offered a resolution declaratory of the policy of the United States on the Monroe doctrine, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of any power or powers on this continent by way of colonization of any supposed territory in the Western Hemisphere."

"Second—That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which by reason of proximity such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and integrity of our institutions."

"Third—That the true ground on which the Monroe doctrine was based, and on which any similar position has been taken, rests for its justification on what may be our interest, and not on the principle that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any power or powers."

"Fourth—That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory in the Western Hemisphere, then for us to determine whether our safety and integrity demand that we resist such action by armed force if necessary."

"Fifth—That the executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine with vigor, and has contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the position thus taken has been to protect this government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States. That this policy has been unwelcome and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entanglements with foreign powers, whether they be European or American."

"Sixth—That this action was premature looking to the history of the controversy and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country."

"Seventh—That neither Congress nor the country can be expected to support the action or position of the Executive Department in reference to the encroachment boundary controversy, and that the course pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final decision of the United States to our province to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people and the integrity of our institutions."

CALL'S CUBAN RESOLUTION.

The Call Cuban resolution provoked some discussion owing to the fact that it "directed" that information be furnished, Mr. Sherman said, such request should not be made at a time when the uprising extends all through the island of Cuba. It might prove a serious embarrassment to our consuls and subject them to prosecution by the Spanish or the insurgents in the locality of the consuls.

Mr. Call gave notice that he would move at an early day for the discharge of the committee on foreign relations from further consideration of the resolution for the recognition of the Cuban revolution.

He would do this, he said, in order to bring the Senate to a direct vote on the question without further delay.

Mr. Platt said he had heard much talk as recognizing the Cuban insurgents. But he pointed out that this was a question primarily within the jurisdiction of the President. Moreover, the recognition of the insurgents was not to be viewed as an act done by the United States, but as a question affecting the United States for its moral effect and for sympathetic reasons, then it would be considered as an offense against the parent country. No one doubted, Mr. Platt said, the feeling of sympathy for the Cuban people who engaged in a struggle for liberty.

AWARDED
Highest Honors—World's Fair.

DR.

CREAM

SOAP

MAKES SOFT
WHITE HANDS.

MOST PERFECT MADE.

A pure Glycerin of Tallow Powder. Free from Ammonia, Alum or any other adulterant.

40 YEARS THE STANDARD.

but in shaping the official course of the government, every member should be according to the recognized rule of international law.

Mr. Hale stated that, in round numbers, the bill commits the United States to a subsidy of about \$250,000. It was a plain business proposition, bringing Hawaii close to our doors. Nations had sought to establish an influence with the Hawaiian government, which, if successful, would involve nothing but detriment to us. The Senator detailed the efforts of Great Britain to secure the Hawaiian Islands for itself, and the frustration of its efforts by the Hawaiian government, and the raising of the Hawaiian flag. As to the influence of the cable on the question of annexation, the Senator said he did not care whether it would or would not expedite that result. Annexation was an event sure to come in the near future, and he did not want to precipitate it. Of one thing he felt sure, and that was, that the cable would take notice of the interests of the two governments and that attempts at interference from the outside would forever cease. If we abandoned the Hawaiian Islands, the British would take them, and by hook or crook, get a footing on the Hawaiian Islands, and great military and commercial British ocean cable.

Mr. Allen favored a cable to Hawaii, but opposed the present bill on the ground that he feared that the arrangement proposed would lead to a complete annexation. At the close of his speech the bill was referred to the committee on foreign relations.

Mr. Peffer then concluded his speech, begun yesterday, on the pending silver bond bill, his argument being directed against bond issues and the gold standard.

Mr. Hale spoke for an hour in favor of a Pacific cable connecting the United States and Hawaii, and the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States was certain to be accomplished at an early day.

THE PENSION BILL.

General Debate Concluded—Bartlett's Defense of His Position.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16.—The general discussion of the pension bill in the House closed to-day and to-morrow it will be taken up by Mr. Bartlett. When the House opened Mr. Grow arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Grow demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Grow contended that since reflections upon the whole House were questions of privileges, reflections upon the whole House was much more privileged. "The board of arbitration did not award a dollar of damages to any party," he said, "and it was made and not paid."

Mr. Speaker ruled that no question of privilege was presented, whereupon Mr. Grow took his seat, saying, "Well, I am not going to speak."

A bill was passed authorizing the leasing of lands in Arizona for educational purposes.

The House then resumed consideration of the pension bill and an order was adopted to carry out the provisions of the law relative to the distribution of seeds and of government publications.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

Mr. Bartlett then arose and declared that the New York Chamber of Commerce, in a pamphlet printed by that body and widely circulated, had cast reflections on the good faith of the House. The pamphlet criticized the House's action in passing the pension bill, and asserted that it had been arbitrarily awarded to the owner of the seized vessels. Mr. Bartlett demanded to be allowed to speak upon it as a question of privilege, but Mr. Crisp made the point that the pamphlet presented no question of privilege.

AN ENGLISH AND A FLYING

DESTINATION OF THE FLYING
SQUADRON STILL UNKNOWN.All Foreigners Arrested in Transvaal
to be Defended by Counsel Em-
ployed by Great Britain.

EVIDENCE OF CONSPIRACY

DOCUMENTS FOUND ON THE KRUGERSDORP BATTLEFIELD.

They Are Said to Prove the British
South African Company Intended
to Seize the Republic.

LONDON, Jan. 17.—There were no sensational developments in the Transvaal affairs yesterday. The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent to the Transvaal, and that the British South African Company intended to seize the Republic."

The Standard says: "The destination of the flying squadron is still a mystery. It was rumored yesterday that the squadron would be sent